

in the birth rate. It is owing to this germinal change that the post-War population has developed an environment which is unsuited to the education of more than one or two children per family—simply because more than that number are not wanted. I realize that these obvious environmental difficulties offer a temptingly simple explanation, and, as I have said, I do not deny them a certain importance. But I think it has been over-stressed. Even in an environment like the present, which so discourages the raising of a family, a strong reproductive impulse will nevertheless overcome all obstacles; and the marriage for money is still sometimes associated with high fertility—e.g. among the German ruling princes. It only causes the catastrophe of birth-rate decline when it also involves selection for low fertility. A change in the germ-plasm is therefore the most important cause, and I consider I am justified in attributing the decline in the birth rate to hereditary agencies.

Selection for low fertility follows quite unconsciously upon the marriage for money, because the daughters of small families—i.e. the least fertile families—possess, *ceteris paribus*, the largest dowries. My article in this number affords the first mathematical proof of this process. The question has nothing to do with the inability of women to bear children, with actual barrenness, and so on. It is solely a matter of the philoprogenitive impulse.

W. WAGNER-MANSLAU.

pr. Arzt. Danzig-Langfuhr,
Brunshoefer Weg 20.

A Contraception Museum

To the Editor, *Eugenics Review*.

SIR,—As an outcome of research which has been carried out for the last three years (for the National Committee on Maternal Health, New York) in the Institute of Animal Genetics, Edinburgh, a contraception museum was formed in the Department of Public Health of that city. This has given rise to so much interest that another has now been formed in the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine.

The ethical aspects have been entirely neglected, since there appears to be evidence that woman will continue to regulate her reproductive life, and thus it would appear to be our duty to see that the methods which she uses will be harmless and efficient.

The museum has been divided into the following sections:

- (a) The Scope of the Research.
- (b) The Anatomy of Reproductive Organs, with special reference to their relationship during coitus, and the fitting of mechanical contraceptives.
- (c) The effect of pure Chemicals upon the life and vitality of the Spermatozoa.

- (d) A study of Vehicles for the suspension of Spermicides.
- (e) A study of proprietary Contraceptives; their quality, behaviour and packing.
- (f) The Chemistry of Rubber.
- (g) Summary.

It would appear extremely doubtful that one universally applicable contraceptive method will be found, and hence we have attempted to delineate the optimum for success for each type so that the medical man can choose with reference to the patient under consideration.

All who are interested in the many aspects of this work will be most welcome.

CECIL I. B. VOGEL.

London School of Hygiene
and Tropical Medicine.

The Effects of Controlling Sex-Determination

To the Editor, *Eugenics Review*

SIR,—In the last of your "Notes of the Quarter" in your current number *re* "the highly probable eventuality" of ever being able to predetermine sex, you say:

"We can now only speculate whether the proportion of boys to girls will be ten or twenty to one." You continue and add: "What the effect will be on our social and sexual life is beyond the most unflinching imagination." Frankly, I have never met one so unflinching as the man who wrote that! Who or what made him so very positive that the Race would choose to have so many more boys than girls? He seems to have "no possible probable manner of doubt" on this very moot point, and the idea that there might be the reverse belief held by many (so far) highly respected Scientists never enters his hot head. Surely all of us have heard and taken part in many debates on this very subject for the last at least thirty years. I have and heard many of your Members and others of the very greatest living members of Mankind(!) of a good many nationalities debate the point and never yet have I heard anything like agreement having been reached—except, of course, amongst entirely unscientific people and they usually think that things will tend to settle down very much the same as they are. Perhaps they will, too. I have known that sort of people be right before, though it always gives me rather "a turn" when they are!

Meantime what on earth is *your* authority for the presumption and whence your evidence? Then a horrid voice whispers: "Is it possible that there is some fact not known to me, but only to you and the rest of the world? Banish the thought! I can only presume therefore and take refuge in the theory that you, Sir, are the father of a vast family of daughters and that a

wish has once more fathered a monstrous thought. Or can it be that you have a veritable army of unemployed sons and persistently (and surely a little egotistically, too!), presume that everyone else in the future, with power to choose, will follow your unhappy example?

N. TEULON PORTER.

The "Half-Moon,"
Little St. Mary's Lane,
Cambridge.

We beg to assure Dr. Porter that the Editorial Committee have given due consideration to his letter; but they are nevertheless of the opinion that there is sufficient general agreement on the point at issue to justify the uneasiness expressed in our speculation.—ED.

Sexual Morality

To the Editor, *Eugenics Review*

SIR,—My REVIEW having been delayed in transmission, I have only now read, on page 243, Mrs. Chance's notice of Dr. William J. Robinson's book, *Woman, Her Sex and Love Life*. Mrs. Chance quotes from this with approval, assuring us that "few things are more needed in sex education to-day than his teaching that—'the first idea we must endeavour to destroy is that it is impossible for a human being to love more than one other human being at the same time.'"

We are to learn that "A man or a woman is able to love and love very deeply a number of times, and love simultaneously or successively." Most of us—at any rate those blessed with families and friends—know quite well that we can and do love these "simultaneously and successively."

But as the book appears to be wholly occupied with "sex," one realizes that the author must be referring to the love of man and woman as dedicated to one another in marriage, and one then naturally asks whether faithfulness and loyalty have no part in his scheme of life, and whether he is suggesting as desirable a return to polygamy—or polyandry? or both?

For certainly monogamous marriage would be a farce if entered into with the intention of "loving simultaneously" any of the opposite sex who might attract the fancy of either partner! Dr. Robinson's depressing outlook (called by Mrs. Chance his "tolerant understanding of sex-life"), perhaps results inevitably from contact with the abnormally over-sexed men and women with whom he has had so much to do—the vast majority of happily married people, having no "confessions" to bring, are quite unlikely to have troubled him, and it may be his preoccupation with the other type which leads him to believe that "Woman is much more the slave of her sex nature than a man is"—a statement which may, or may not be well-

founded in America, but which is wildly untrue as regards the majority of our own countrywomen.

It has been my lot so often to contend with "Traditionalists" of the old school on the subjects of Marriage, Divorce Law Reform and Birth Control that I hardly know myself in taking up the cudgels on the other side, and only do so on behalf of decent young people contemplating marriage, who are indeed between Scylla and Charybdis, if the only alternative to the narrow views of the Roman Church, and of a part of our own—is to be the sensual chaos apparently proposed by Dr. Robinson, with its arid, loveless self-indulgence—its utter lack of romance—its indifference to the things of the Spirit.

I cannot believe that the majority of your readers are indifferent to the tyranny exercised by those who yield to their impulses, regardless of the rights and happiness of others, and with whom the gratification of desire seems to be shorn of all the romance, the constancy and protective and enduring tenderness that makes it worthy the name of Love.

But—as the Master of Selwyn College reminds us in his recent book *The New Morality*—"the commonplaces of the marital ideal ought to be made clear beyond mistaking, for perhaps it is really the fact that there are some who have been brought up with no knowledge of these things, and have thus been left at the mercy of all the wild talking and writing which has followed the war like a plague."

These things are surely of vital importance to us who are Eugenists and have the welfare of mankind at heart, for "without morality there is no prospect for society save disintegration, and no prospect for the race save decay."

M. A. BINSTAD.

Crescent House, Hereford.

Eugenics and Capitalism

To the Editor, *Eugenics Review*

SIR,—It is very strange that most advanced eugenists are politically reactionary when the dysgenics of capitalism are so obvious.

A great number of wealthy and spurious eugenists believe that capitalism is defensible because it leads to the survival of the fittest—it is justified because it has produced *them*. That is what William Morris called the "Survival of the Vulgarest," and what Marxists, who are strong Darwinians (witness their recent celebrations in his honour), decry as the distortion of the Evolution theory, the prostitution of Eugenics.

True eugenists should be the first to condemn capitalism, not to praise it. We have four main arguments to support our case: that the abolition of our present economic system is demanded on biological grounds.